



CALFED  
BAY-DELTA  
PROGRAM

1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155  
Sacramento, California 95814

(916) 657-2666  
FAX (916) 654-9780

February 1, 1996

David R. E. Aladjem  
Downey, Brand, Seymour, & Rohwer  
555 Capitol Mall, 10th Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Aladjem:

Thank you for your letter of December 8, 1995, commenting on the workshop of December 4, 1995. We apologize for the delay in responding to your letter. However, I wanted to respond to several of the issues you raised.

We agree that the level of detail provided for in the December Workshop package on alternatives was limited in specificity and not sufficient to assess the appropriateness of proposed actions, especially as they might pertain to "core" actions. The materials under development for the next workshop in February contain much more detail and should go a long way toward responding to your interests in having qualitative information on each action. However, the action descriptions are not always so detailed as to spell out the precise details such as site location and other quantitative details. Aspects of the alternatives must be relatively "open" at this point if we are to keep the flexibility we need to design and refine the potential alternatives throughout the Phase I process.

You have rightly pointed out the very general aspect of our current Solution Principles. We have since refined our solution principles to give them more specificity and clarity (attached). These additional details are included in recognition of the fact that the more general wording of the solution principles is not adequate to effectively apply the concepts of the solution principles on the alternatives as they are developed. I hope that the further refinement of the principles addresses your concerns, especially your comment regarding the need to recognize ecosystem impacts outside the Bay-Delta System--this is addressed directly in our Solution Principle of "no significant redirected impacts."

As to the issue of demand management, you raise several issues concerning the concept of demand management and the role it can have as part of the alternatives. A discussion paper on the subject has been included in the packet for the next BDAC meeting,

---

CALFED Agencies

California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Fish and Game  
Department of Water Resources  
California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board

Federal

Environmental Protection Agency  
Department of the Interior  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service

G - 0 0 0 5 0 7

G-000507

David R. E. Aladjem  
February 1, 1996  
Page Two

and the ensuing discussions should assist us in identifying in greater detail the potential benefits of various levels of demand management on the quality of the alternatives. We welcome your input into these discussions. If you are not on the BDAC mailing list, please call our office for a copy of the paper next week.

Finally, you suggest that D-1485 is the proper baseline for our environmental analysis. We are currently in the process of developing criteria to apply to both policies and projects which might be considered as part of baseline conditions. This will also be an important discussion at the Phase II scoping meetings generally scheduled for mid April.

Again, we thank you for your comments and your interest in the CALFED Bay Delta Program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lester A. Snow', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lester A. Snow, Executive Director  
CALFED Bay-Delta Program

Attachment